UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Why We Should Aid Great Britain - - - - - - - - - *Paul H. Douglas*

War Is Not Romance - - - *Eric Gill*

Philosophy and Religion - *Archie J. Bahm*

THE STUDY TABLE
Ralph Cheyney

VOLUME CXXVII NUMBER 2

Chicago, April, 1941

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Monthly *Subscription $1.50*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Declaration

In this time of growing tension of opinion and intolerance of spirit, it is appropriate that UNITY should reaffirm its position as a journal of liberal opinion.

UNITY is interested in no political party or platform, is bound to no school of philosophy or theology, is the organ of no sect or denomination, and is the voice of no organized movement. Rather is UNITY dedicated to certain underlying principles, namely, freedom, fellowship, and character in religion. It seeks the fulfilment of certain ideals, namely, representative democracy, peace, brotherhood, the commonwealth of man which is the kingdom of God on earth.

In dedication to its principles and in pursuit of its ideals, UNITY maintains the rule of liberty. Its editors, editorial contributors, and correspondents speak with unfettered freedom the convictions of their own minds within the general framework of a journal of liberal opinion. The writers of articles, reviews, and poems present their own ideas, which may, at times, be at variance with those of the editors. UNITY would repress no utterance and control no argument that is competent and honest, for it is skeptical of conformity and averse to authority, which always tend to hamper individual liberty. It is happy in those diversities of gifts and ideas which are the glory of the one spirit.

In this period of trial and crisis, UNITY would unite anew its editors and readers in the service of *Character* which is the substance of religion, *Freedom* which is its life, and *Fellowship* which is its goal. Thus would we vindicate our country, our civilization, our culture, religious and lay, in a period when all alike are threatened with extinction.

Contents

EDITORIAL—

The Policy of UNITY—CURTIS W. REESE 19
America As a World Power—CURTIS W. REESE 19
Editorial Comment—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 20
Jottings—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 23

ARTICLES—

Why We Should Aid Great Britain—PAUL H. DOUGLAS 23
War Is Not Romance—ERIC GILL 26
Philosophy and Religion—ARCHIE J. BAHM 28
On the Pacifist Front—XXXIII—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 30

POETRY—

The Judge—EDITH LOVEJOY PIERCE 29

THE STUDY TABLE—

Poets Think for Themselves and Feel for Others—RALPH CHEYNEY 31

THE FIELD—

Remembering the Heroes of Peace—Peace Heroes Memorial Society 18
The Cable Hymn 18

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Remembering the Heroes of Peace

Notwithstanding untoward conditions, the Peace Heroes Memorial Society is still functioning.

The Cincinnati group of the society plans to hold its nineteenth annual service of remembrance for heroes and heroines of peace, on or near Memorial Day, 1941. After a program of songs, readings, devotions, and an address, flowers will be placed upon the graves of men and women who have lost their lives in the discharge of their occupational duties, and of a woman who died in childbirth. Bishop Paul Jones, the president of the society, will preside.

Now, that America is again acclaiming the heroes of war, is the time for all the greater concern that the heroes and heroines of peace be not forgotten.

Material for Peace Heroes exercises in schools, churches, and cemeteries will be furnished without charge upon communicating with the secretary, Abraham Cronbach, 842 Lexington Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.

The Cable Hymn

Seventy-eight years ago was laid the famous Atlantic cable. In celebration of this tremendous event, John Greenleaf Whittier wrote the following hymn, later published in his volume, "The Tent on the Beach." Whittier's hymn was a paeon of peace—a declaration that the bonding of the East and West, Europe and America, by the cable wires was a weaving of

"The bridal robes of earth's accord,
The funeral shroud of war."

The same hope was cherished when the newspaper press was invented, when wireless was discovered, when the miracle of radio was consummated. These things bring men together, enable men to understand one another—this was the argument! But just the opposite has been true. We have been defeated in all our hopes. War and not peace has been the result of man's nearer acquaintanceship. Why? There is a question for the psychologists and historians!—*Editor.*

O lonely bay of Trinity,
O dreary shores give ear!
Lean down unto the white-lipped sea
The voice of God to hear!

From world to world his couriers fly,
Thought-winged and shod with fire;
The angel of his stormy sky
Rides down the sunken wire.

What saith the herald of the Lord?
"The world's long strife is done;
Close wedded by that mystic cord,
Its continents are one.

"And one in heart as one in blood,
Shall all her peoples be;
The hands of human brotherhood
Are clasped beneath the sea.

(*Continued on page* 32)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXVII APRIL, 1941 No. 2

EDITORIAL

CURTIS W. REESE

THE POLICY OF UNITY

The Board of Directors of The Abraham Lincoln Centre, the publisher of UNITY, has recently reaffirmed the traditional policy of UNITY as a journal of liberal opinion, and has taken steps to see to it that this policy is maintained. In fulfillment of this action, UNITY will continue to be a voice of competent and responsible, honest and fair opinion within the framework of democratic purposes; and will not become the organ of any particular dogmatic movement whether pacifist or otherwise. Points of view that are honestly held, competently stated, and that contribute to democratic purposes will always be welcomed in the columns of UNITY. A liberal journal, like the liberal spirit which it seeks to foster, aims at well-grounded and sober judgments on social issues, and at just and reasonable appraisals of the personalities active in the social scene. Such a journal avoids the extreme and the extravagant, even as it does the false and the mean. It has a wholesome respect for facts and for accuracy in the use of them, and it will not be a party to the careless use of facts, nor to the twisting of them to fit preconceived purposes. Liberal journalism is a sacred trust, and it may not be used as an instrument of sectarianism nor as a screen for illiberal purposes. A reasonable extension of liberal policies in the field of journalism is the new policy of UNITY requiring that all matter published in these columns, whether by editors, contributors, or correspondents, must be written in the first person singular and signed by the name of the writer. It is believed by many that the traditional editorial "we" should be abandoned in all journalism and that writers should indicate their responsibility for what they say by attaching their names to it. Anonymity is not necessarily a journalistic virtue. But a policy requiring signed copy does not mean that UNITY or any other journal is obliged to publish anything and everything that is signed. No journal is under obligation to furnish space to anybody and everybody. Every journal has the right to judge copy in the light of the purpose for which the journal is issued, and its current needs for variety and balance of copy. Moreover, any journal that is worthy of a claim on the minds of liberal people will strive to eliminate, or reduce to the minimum, copy by writers who characteristically impugn the motives of persons who do not agree with them or who indulge in vicious epithets or who obviously have a personal axe to grind. The long-run purpose of a liberal journal is best served by original and competent discussion of serious issues by persons whose training and experience indicate that they know what they are talking about. By these high principles and policies I, as Managing Editor of UNITY, shall seek to fulfill the editorial duties committed to me.

AMERICA AS A WORLD POWER

Perhaps the most encouraging thing in these troubled times is the far-seeing and determined purpose of President Roosevelt to put the moral and material force of this nation into the world-scales on the side of human liberty, and the ratification of this purpose by the duly-elected representatives of the American people. The significance of this purpose and action has given new hope to the sorely-pressed British people and to suppressed peoples everywhere. Already there is a marked rise in the tempo of democratic determination throughout the world. The President with consummate skill has lifted the whole issue to the high level of his four freedoms—freedoms applicable everywhere in the world. It is not too early to begin thinking of these larger objectives of the tragic struggle now going on and in which America will undoubtedly play an increasing role. Whether we like it or not, America is now a world power of such superior strength that it could not, even if it would, avoid playing a determining part in world affairs. The very force of economic and political events moves America out into the deep waters of international life; and our fortunate situation lays upon us a heavy duty to all mankind. In the fulfillment of our duties we shall no doubt make many blunders and we shall certainly be called imperialistic, but despite blunders and despite charges of imperialism America will play an increasingly dominant role in the course

of human history for the next half century or more. I hope that we do a better job as a world power than has been the case with our predecessors; we could hardly do worse. People who have a clear vision of possibilities in the way of large-scale world reform should be especially vigilant in guiding our thinking and planning to the end that freedom shall in fact be our aim—everywhere in the world.

Editorial Comment

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

I

With the entrance of UNITY upon a monthly basis of publication, there have come certain editorial changes which should be known to UNITY's readers.

Thus, disturbed by the Editor's pacifist views and policies, and unwilling to be responsible for them in these times, the Directors, at the suggestion of the Managing Editor, have adopted a resolution which contains the following:

> That the functions of the Managing Editor are understood by this Board to be not merely those of business manager, but particularly, in view of the fact that his duties are at the office of publication where quick and far-reaching decisions must at times be made, to include specifically primary responsibility to this Board for the maintenance of the liberal policy of UNITY to the end that UNITY shall not be, nor appear to be, committed to either movements or organizations antagonistic to the processes of liberal democracy.

This means that the control of UNITY is now definitely in the hands of the Managing Editor. As Editor, therefore, I am no longer responsible for anything that appears in UNITY's columns apart from the editorials. As regards these editorials, the Directors have adopted another resolution, as follows:

> That hereafter all matter published in UNITY, whether editorial or otherwise, and whether written by the Editor, the Managing Editor, or contributors, shall be written in the first person and signed with the full name of the writer.

This means, among other things, that the Editor can henceforth publish in UNITY only what he himself signs personally. Just how long I can or should function under these conditions is a question. For the present I am following the Asquithian policy of "watching and waiting."

II

Bruce Bliven, in a brilliant article in the *New Republic* on "Science Creates a New World," estimates that whereas "Thoreau had twenty things which he regarded as essential when he lived at Walden Pond, the average American family today has 9,000." That estimate, 9,000, seems to me conservative. Not 9,000 but nine times 9,000 are the mechanical gadgets and material objects galore without which no man in our contemporary world can regard himself as happy. And isn't this what's the matter with our world—or at least one of the basic things that's the matter? This infernal lust after physical possessions, this absorption in the myriad contrivances which our diabolical machines can produce, this fascination over radios, automobiles, cigarette lighters, lighting fixtures, cosmetics, hats and dresses, airplanes, bombing planes, submarines, gas masks, and bombing shelters—what does it all add up to but the nearest thing to hell that man has seen since Dante visited Inferno? What was Thoreau but a civilized man who had achieved the durable satisfactions of life by turning inward to the things of the spirit? What is the typical modern man but a barbarian who amuses himself with the multitudinous products of our machine-age the way a savage amuses himself with beads and bits of glasses? The great masters of human living—Buddha, Jesus, St. Francis, Tolstoi, Thoreau, and now Gandhi—agree upon no one principle so emphatically as that of emancipation from desire for and slavery to material things. And here we are in the midst of a society, dominated by an utterly materialistic science, which would bind us ever tighter to possessions and measure all life by the number and intensity of its desires. Bruce Bliven's article filled me with the "whizzy-whossys." I haven't felt such horror since I visited the "Chamber of Horrors" in the old Eden Museé in New York. If *this* is what we are coming to!! But, perhaps not! Nature has a way of taking care of herself. What has all this materialistic science, with its mechanical miracles, finally produced but the most destructive war in history? Perhaps we'll smash the machines not because we want to, but because fate decrees that they must smash themselves. Then will the dream of Samuel Butler in his *Erewhon* come true. And man at last be free!

III

What about England and this starvation business in Europe? Is not England playing a dangerous game in blocking off all food, even from the conquered countries which are her friends, and thus defeating such a plan for aid as that sponsored by Herbert Hoover? Look, for example, at two stories published side by side in the New York *Times* (March 1st, page 3). Here is a story to this effect:

> They [the English] say that the people [of Norway, Denmark, Belgium, and Holland] are becoming increasingly bitter about . . . the growing food shortage, coupled with a wider realization of the fact that Hitler has stripped them of their food supplies. As living conditions in these countries become worse the British believe that the people's hatred of the Nazis will be increasingly intensified until an overwhelming proportion will eventually be ready to risk their lives in an effort to regain their freedom.

This, of course, is the familiar argument against the Hoover Plan—the theory that, if the Norwegians, et al.,

are left to starve, they will rebel against their conquerors. Now turn to the other *Times* story, which has to do not with theory but with fact. This is a dispatch from Vichy, France, which faces the same food problem as the little democracies:

> It was estimated . . . that, at the present rate of consumption, existing stocks [of wheat] would not last much beyond the first of April. . . . The bread crisis is coming at a time when it is difficult to get potatoes. . . . The tendency of the press in recent weeks would indicate that when the shortage of wheat begins to be felt, the British blockade will be blamed. . . . Those to suffer, it is argued, will be the native inhabitants of France and other occupied countries who could have sufficient to live on if the British would let in shipments they are ready to pay for.

There you have it—the fact, as over against the theory! The theory that starving Europeans would rise up against the Nazis when food is waiting to get through an obdurate British blockade is absurd to anybody who knows anything about psychology and about the history of the last war. For the horror now impending *"the British will be blamed,"* and millions of friends thus turned into enemies. If Britain does not see this, her cause is doomed not by Hitler but by her own stupidity.

IV

The passage of the Lease-Lend Bill brings us into a third and final period of the history of this country in relation to the European crisis. The first period, roughly running from 1919 to 1938, may be said to be the period in which America was resolved to keep out of European struggles. "Never again" was the slogan of this hour. We had gone into the war of 1914-18 with the cleanest motives and the highest ideals, so far at least as the great mass of the citizenry was concerned, and we not only accomplished nothing, but actually perpetuated and strengthened those very influences of secret diplomacy, imperialistic rule, and balance of power, which we had hoped to destroy. So in disgust we repudiated the Versailles Treaty, refused to enter the League of Nations and turned to domestic affairs. The high-water mark of this period was the Nye munitions investigation, when we found out a lot of the truth about this war business, and the passage of the Neutrality Act, which was an attempt to insure this country against participation in another war. The second period, from 1938 to 1941, from the Munich pact to the Lease-Lend Bill, is the period when, in defiance of every safeguard and all high intention, we went slipping and sliding into the second World War. A good part of the slipping and sliding, as we now know, was the result of deliberate pushing, first from London and then from Washington. The first big result was achieved in the amendment of the Neutrality Act, permitting the sale of munitions and other war material to Great Britain. The second big event was the gift of fifty destroyers to the Empire in exchange for certain naval bases in this hemisphere. After that "the descent into Avernus" was rapid, culminating in the lease-lend legislation. "Short of war" was the slogan of this period—as dishonest a cry as ever bedevilled the thinking of a great people. With the ending of this second period of our relationship to Europe, there comes now the third, which is *war*. This war is still disguised—how long before the disguise will be removed is anybody's guess! Perhaps Hitler will have as much to say about this as America. But, disguised or open, the war is here, and the terrible ordeal is begun. I should hate to be Mr. Roosevelt before the bar of history—the man who, in the face of explicit pledges to keep this nation out of foreign wars, has now taken us in. How long will it be before, in violation of other explicit pledges, he sends our boys, in naval or military uniform, across the seas to die? He acts, and then gives us a fireside chat on the radio. But history is not fooled, as God is not mocked.

V

The trouble with the Dies Committee is not that it is investigating subversive activities in this country. This right of investigating is one of the priceless instrumentalities of democracy, whether operated by Congress or by the various state legislatures. Think of what the Pujo Investigating Committee accomplished years ago in its inquiry into the money power. Remember what the Seabury Investigating Committee accomplished in New York in the days of Jimmy Walker and "the little tin boxes." Keep in mind the recent La Follette Committee and its work for civil liberties and the rights of labor. We know of no more useful function in our whole legislative procedure than that of official inquiry into the ways of government and the mores of society. And that's just where the trouble with the Dies Committee comes in! For this Committee discredits the investigating system. It puts under suspicion and alarm this whole method of setting up a committee, clothing it with power, and releasing it to get the facts. In the first place, the Dies Committee is a one-man committee. Months pass and the committee does not meet; but all the while the Chairman is rampaging about the country, and stirring up strife and bitterness. In the second place, the Committee, while sturdily sincere, is prejudiced, and notoriously irresponsible. The result is an inquiry which is a cross between a circus and a witch-hunt. In the third place, the Committee has never had a competent counsel to direct its inquiries and guide its activities. Lastly, the Committee has never surveyed the whole field, never mapped out a complete, unbiased and thoroughgoing campaign, but on the contrary has darted here, and jumped there, all the while pursuing so-called "reds" and radicals, to the almost complete neglect of "blacks" and reactionaries generally. It is the Communists and not the Fascists that Martin Dies has been after. Why not both? The record of the Committee and its Chairman to date contains much interesting and some valuable material—but to all too great an extent it is a mass of unfounded charges and counter-charges, irrelevancies,

slanders, smears, and evidence unchecked and wildly extravagant. That the people of this country want this investigation is shown by the repeated renewal of the Committee's life by larger and ever larger majorities in the House of Representatives. The pity of it is that Mr. Dies is not relieved of his labors, and a chairman and committee appointed competent to do the real work of scientific political inquiry.

VI

There is no accounting for tastes, nor for ideas. The vagaries of current public opinion pass all explanation save that of the current war-madness of the hour. For example! The people most ardent for America's entrance into the war, or at least "all-out" aid for Britain, are just the people who are most bitterly opposed to Communism. But if there is anything in the world at the present moment which is propitious for the coming of Communism, it is this war. Keep the war going for another year, two years, or three years, and the coming of Communism to all of Europe is as certain as the rising of the sun tomorrow morning. And nothing is so certain to keep the war going to the last dread point of exhaustion and collapse as the participation of the United States in the struggle. Which means, logically, that those supporting the present belligerent policies of the government are helping on the cause most certain to make their blackest fears come true! The militarists, that is to say, are the very ones who are clearing the way for Communism. But look at the Communists—what are *they* doing? Opposing the war, denouncing it as a sordid imperialistic conflict, moving heaven and earth to keep the United States out of it! But if they succeed in this campaign, then Communism will be indefinitely postponed, if not finally destroyed. It is only in a war-wracked and war-ruined world that Communism has any chance. It was only in the collapse of Russia in 1917 that Communism came at all. And it will only be in the similar collapse of Europe in 1942 or '47 that Communism will find completion of its earlier triumph. Pacify the world, stabilize it, organize and reëstablish it, and Communism will disappear like disease-germs in sunlight and fresh air. The Communists, in other words, in working to stop or prevent the spread of this war, are striving with all their might and main to preserve the order which must permanently defeat their hoped-for revolution. Or take the New Dealers! They are hailing the war as a drowning man his rescuer. Eight years of futile spending of money and juggling of figures, and trying this and trying that, and the depression as it was just at the beginning! Now comes the war and the opening of our "arsenal of democracy," and everything is booming again. At last is unemployment gone and industry flourishing. But has not the President, or any of his advisors, thought of the end of the war? What will happen when the fighting stops, and all the war business comes in an instant to an end! Talk about depressions! This next one will be the real thing. And the President is working for it night and day, tooth and nail. What a world! Satan's "Evil, be thou my good" come true!

VII

It's time that record was again made in these columns of the foolishness that is going on today under the impact of the war hysteria "cock-and-bulled" by the Washington administration. The people, it is to be said, are not to be blamed, for a shout of "fire," when frightening enough, will always start a panic. But the things that are being done are nonetheless ridiculous. Imagine it! In New York City a series of "black-out" rehearsals are being held in various neighborhoods, all leading up to a city-wide "black-out" demonstration this coming spring. * * * The Lease-Lend Bill has been passed, scrapping our whole structure of constitutional government, and rearing in its stead an out-and-out dictatorship. * * * Inspection in New York has disclosed an amazing number of underground passages, vaults, cellars. They are welcomed as bomb shelters. * * * A citizen of Boston urges that the filling in of the abandoned Arlington Street subway entrance in that city be stopped, as the underground space might be useful as a shelter from air raids. * * * The Merchants Association of New York is urging Congress to pass a National Daylight Saving Law "as a means of furthering national defense." * * * An air-raid rehearsal is being arranged for the Atlantic seaboard. The plan calls for thousands of watchers in observation posts. * * * Nearly 200 Greater Boston women have formed the nucleus of the Massachusetts Women's Civilian Defense School, "to formulate plans for training women to participate in emergency defense services in time of war." * * * Seattle, on the west coast, has had a practice "black-out." * * * The Dalton School in New York has erected a bomb shelter in New Milford, Connecticut, and one hundred students and fifteen teachers have been living there "to test the efficiency with which school children could be evacuated in case of war." * * * The Allerton House in New York has constructed an air-raid shelter, forty-five feet underground in its sub-basement, for the protection of its guests in case of bombardment. * * * Strikes of every description or for any cause, even the strike of the bus drivers in New York, are being denounced as interference with national defense. * * * The New York Fire Department is preparing to teach five thousand women to assist the Department in fire fighting and prevention as a defense measure against invasion. * * * Fairfield, Connecticut, a charming town, has organized a Defense Committee, with doctors, nurses, fire wardens and explosive experts all on duty for emergency service. The Nazi invaders would of course make straight for Fairfield! * * * Thus do Americans fan their fears. Some day we will laugh at all these things, but now they are serious as the hysteria that leads to war.

Jottings

For months, now, we have been reading about this war—and the British Empire, and the Third Reich, and Mussolini, and the Kremlin. But who ever mentions the people living in these countries, or cares a fig about them?

When wilt thou save the people?
O God of mercy, when?
Not kings and lords, but nations!
Not crowns and thrones, but men!

"I laugh that I may not weep," said Voltaire. Thank heaven that Mussolini is around these days!

The Nofrontier News Service publishes an interesting statement by Senator Thomas Pickering, spoken in 1808:

> The French Emperor [Napoleon] is the most ruthless tyrant that has scourged the European world since the Roman Empire fell. Suppose the British Navy were destroyed and France triumphed over Great Britain—to the titles of Bonaparte would then be added that of Emperor of the Two Americas; for what legions of soldiers could he not send to the United States in the thousands of British ships, were they also at his command?

Pickering was evidently as scared in 1808 as some distinguished Americans are scared today.

> Although the long bus haul from Orlando last night brought the players [New York Giants] back to their headquarters after midnight, Terry had them out at 11 o'clock this morning as usual.—New York *Times*.

What pampered pets these baseball players are! How many times has a train or a bus ride brought me home long after midnight, and I have been at my desk the next morning at nine o'clock as usual.

The Vichy government has banned Romain Rolland's *Jean Christophe* and twenty-two other standard French books. The next thing it will be burning them, and thus living up to the best Nazi standards.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Why We Should Aid Great Britain

PAUL H. DOUGLAS

No sane person can afford to neglect the effect upon the United States of the war now waging in Europe. There are those who pretend that it will make no difference to us whichever side wins. But we have only to ask ourselves what will be the results to us of a British or German victory to see how hollow this attitude is.

1. Should Britain win, our shores will be safe from attack. The British aristocracy and intellectuals will probably continue to irritate us by their air of effortless superiority and their disdain for all things American, but we will not be in danger. For Great Britain has controlled the seas for a century and a quarter and has never menaced the United States. Indeed, our political relations with that country have steadily improved ever since the Civil War. A British victory with the defeat of Nazism on the continent of Europe and of imperialistic Japan in Asia would clear both the Atlantic and the Pacific of threats and would give us a relatively long period of peace during which we might build up a system of international organization to prevent and suppress war. We could then reduce our army to, say, 600,000 men and operate with a somewhat smaller navy. With peace, production would increase and the standard of living would rise. We would have the time and energy to achieve a greater degree of social justice and a true economic democracy. We would in short have the chance to progress.

2. Far otherwise would be our fate if Hitler wins. For if England falls, the French fleet would finally pass into German hands. Even without the British fleet, the combined navies of Germany, Italy, and Japan plus France would give Hitler a naval superiority over us of more than two to one. But in all probability the British fleet would also be taken over by Hitler. For Hitler would hold all England as well as the families of British sailors as hostages for the fleet. This fleet would, by the almost inevitable pressure of defeat, be surrendered. Germany and Japan would then have a naval superiority over us of nearly four tons to every one of ours and their shipbuilding capacity would be five times ours. This would mean that we would lose control over the Atlantic and over the Pacific. Japan would take over China, the Straits Settlements, and the Dutch East Indies. Rubber and tungsten would be shut off from us. The Philippines would be taken by Japan, and all Asia would pass under the fascist yoke.

Hitler, if Britain falls in the spring, will also have an immediate superiority in the air of six planes to our one, i.e., about 30,000 to 5,000. He will have 6,000,000 soldiers to our 700,000 regular army and national guard, and it will probably be a year before we are able to put 1,500,000 more men under selective service in the field as trained soldiers. With Japan's army, the fascist powers will therefore have a military superiority over us of somewhere between 5 and 10 to 1.

Hitler will therefore have the ability to cause us trouble. He certainly has such a desire. This is well shown in Hermann Rauschning's *The Voice of Destruction,* in which this former Nazi leader reports his conversations with Hitler, and which every American should read. On pages 68 to 72 there are a number of references to the United States, in which Hitler expresses his contempt for us and the fact that he intends to take over our country with his storm-troopers. There are two other forces which will drive him on to such a program of conquest. The first is that as long as the United States continues as a democracy, we will be a living

challenge to all that Hitler stands for. We will still be a beacon of hope to the oppressed peoples over whom he rules. He will therefore feel that he must destroy us to eliminate a standing reproach to his whole philosophy of life. There is, therefore, an irrepressible conflict between Democracy and Fascism, just as there was between chattel slavery and freedom. This country, as Lincoln pointed out, could not endure half free and half slave. Neither can the world endure half democratic and half totalitarian. It is we or they.

There is a second force which will drive Hitler onward. He has not been able to solve the problem of giving employment to labor in peacetime pursuits. He has only been able to eliminate unemployment by putting the German workers upon a war basis. This has meant sacrifices, but it has given employment. The coming of peace would present many problems which he could not solve. It would be far easier for him to move on to other fields and feed his semi-starving people upon the rich resources of the United States and the new world. Just as the Huns under Attila moved continuously westward because they devastated the areas over which they rode and ever needed new territory to live upon, so does the slave economy of Nazism need a constant expansion.

Having lost control over the Atlantic it would be virtually impossible for us to defend South America below the "bulge." For, from the aviation base at Dakar where Africa projects toward the "bulge" in South America, German airplanes could make it difficult for our ships to move. Brazil and the Argentine with the smaller satellites of Uruguay and Paraguay would fall under German domination. Our chances of holding off Hitler from Northern South America, the Caribbean, Central America, and Mexico would not be any too strong. For with his crushing superiority he might well be able to get footholds in these countries. His agents would be active within these countries, and if his present alliance with Stalin continues the Communists will work with him as indeed they are now apparently doing in Mexico. We will, therefore, be threatened from the South as well as from the East and West.

Moreover, Hitler through his control of Europe and Africa, and Japan through its control over Asia, will be able to dictate the terms on which we will export. They will seek to use their control over foreign trade to get us to soft-pedal Democracy.

Within our own country, there will be many who will wish us to appease Hitler and to surrender our democracy. These groups are already taking form. They include some of the most reactionary industrialists of the country plus considerable sections of certain foreign groups and support from the extreme left. The Communists and their fellow travelers are now tacit allies of the Fascists and are busily at work sapping and mining within our democracy. They devote their energies to attacking the real and sometimes fictitious weaknesses in Democracy but never criticize the worse evils of Fascism and totalitarianism. They aim to weaken our democracy so that it will not be able to resist as effectively as it might. It is high time that the Communists are recognized as the enemies of a liberal democracy, which they are.

Under these conditions and with the prestige given to Nazism by its successful war in Europe, our country would be in danger from within as well as from without. Our liberties as well as our physical existence would be threatened. Even if we preserved them, we could only do so by putting our whole nation in arms, with a military force of nearly four million soldiers, an air force of from 30,000 to 50,000 planes, and a huge navy. This would call for the expenditure year after year of somewhere around 15 billions of dollars annually. It would mean inevitably that we would have to give up many of the personal and intellectual liberties in a democracy which we properly hold to be dear. Yet all this would be necessary.

Should we not have learned from the disasters which came to England from the Chamberlain policy of appeasement that no country can expect to be safe by letting the wolves devour other countries? Chamberlain and the Tories who then controlled Britain stood aside and let Mussolini take Ethiopia and Albania. They permitted Hitler to rearm the Rhineland and gobble up Austria and Czechoslovakia. They and France permitted a hostile Spain to be created at the western end of the Mediterranean, and then they found that their day had come. By not taking steps to crush Fascism in its early stages when they could have done so, they permitted it to grow so that the war when it did come was on terms disadvantageous to themselves. I know of nothing more ironical than the fact that tanks from the Skoda works in Czechoslovakia, which Chamberlain and Daladier had turned over to Hitler, led the way in the blitzkrieg with which Hitler overpowered Holland, Belgium, and France in a little over a month. So would it be with us. If we permit Hitler to win an easy victory over England, the final struggle will sweep upon us in this hemisphere and perhaps within this very country itself. Then the war which follows will be on terms disadvantageous to ourselves. The best way for us to keep Hitler out of America is to stop him at the British Channel. That is the way to keep the war away from us.

It is for these reasons that I favor now, as I always have done, all aid to Great Britain short of actual war or the sending of a conscripted expeditionary force to Europe. Had we not lifted the embargo and permitted Great Britain to buy planes, guns and ammunition, had we not sold surplus war stocks after the fall of France, and exchanged the 50 over-age destroyers for airplane bases in the British islands off our shores, Great Britain would have gone down long before now. Our aid has been a decisive factor in helping to keep her on her feet and has helped to keep Hitler off our necks. There are few who would now reverse these policies even amongst those who resist any proposals for further aid. But more aid is needed. It can take the form of destroyers, planes, and guns. It may be necessary for it to take the form of naval convoys. But as I see the situation at this moment, the major point on which I would balk would be the sending of an expeditionary force of drafted American boys to fight on the fields of the continent. That I do not want to do. But steps short of that are necessary for our own self-protection.

And it is in that light that all such acts should be considered. The issue is not whether England is an immaculate country. Of course it is not. And it is beside the point for Ex-Governor Phil LaFollette to shout that Buckingham Palace is not the cultural center of America. No sane person believes it is. The primary consideration upon which we should act is the protection of American Democracy and that alone. But this democracy cannot be protected in isolation; it must be protected in the world.

What then are the objections to such a policy of aid to Britain short of sending conscripted troops.

1. The first objection advanced is that such a policy will make Hitler angry and if continued will cause him to attack us. This argument, although advanced by Herbert Hoover and others during the early summer, surely need not be taken seriously. Hitler is angry with us anyway. He is our enemy as he is the enemy of all democracies. It did not help Poland that a brief year before it had aided Hitler to seize Czechoslovakia. It did not help Denmark or Norway that they had maintained a scrupulous neutrality and had zealously tried not to offend Hitler. Nor was the fact that Belgium had repudiated its alliance with France of any avail when Hitler decided to strike. The appeasement policy of Great Britain toward Mussolini as regards Ethiopia and Albania did not placate him nor did their yielding ground to Hitler soften his ire. The truth of the matter is that the democracies cannot appease Hitler. They must either bow the knee or resist. If we are to be true to American ideals we must therefore resist. The question is where and how. It would seem wiser to stop Hitler now at the British Channel than to have him sweep upon us in the western hemisphere.

2. A second objection to aiding Great Britain is that she is likely to be defeated anyway and that not only would all our supplies then go for naught but they might be captured by Hitler and actually be turned against us. Let it be admitted that there are some risks in such aid. There are more risks however in not sending aid. For then Hitler is sure to win and our very existence is in danger. If we continue to send aid in increasing measure, Great Britain has a very good chance to beat off Hitler in 1941. If Great Britain survives 1941, then it has a good chance to take the offensive in 1942 and with the aid of revolutions inside the conquered countries to crush Hitlerism. A dictatorial system flourishes as long as it is winning but since it is not based on popular approval and participation, it cannot survive defeat. In the language of the street, they can give it, but they cannot take it. That is why the democracies have superior staying powers in a war. Since they are based on the popular will, defeats may change the administrations but not the political systems. There is therefore a good chance for an ultimate Nazi defeat. Moreover, if one were to give aid only if a German defeat were certain, there would be little need for our aid. The truth is that nothing in life is certain and the man who refuses to take any risks is a timid and shrinking creature who flees from the rigors of existence. In this world of man-eating sharks, he is the one who is likely to be eaten. There is as great need for valor now as there was in the days of the Civil War, and before that in the period of the revolution.

Finland and Greece have shown that courage and determination still count in war and that apparent miracles can be performed if men will only resist. The best ally the Nazis and the Communists have is the spirit of defeatism which they try to spread among the democracies. That helps to account for the easy victories in Holland, Belgium, and France. But Greece and Finland are living examples of the opposite. The British people have shown that they have stout hearts and that they can and will resist. That gives them a far greater chance than the Low Countries and France who were really beaten before the blitzkrieg started.

But even if the worst were to happen and if Great Britain were to go down, it will make a great deal of difference *when* the catastrophe occurs. If England is conquered this spring, then the Nazi flood is likely to sweep upon this hemisphere and, as it does so, to find us relatively unprepared. But if England can hold on through 1941, then the full swing of our war preparation will be under way. We will have an army of around 2,000,000 trained men in the field. Our airplanes will be pouring out of the factories and the tanks will be rolling off the assembly lines. We will, therefore, be in a far better position to resist, and even if we had to fight a defensive war in this hemisphere we could do so in better hopes of success. On this ground alone aid to Britain can be justified. But happily the British still have a fairly decent chance for an ultimate victory if we will but help them with the full weight of our industrial and economic resources. The result is so important to us and to the world that it would be a gross blunder to withhold our help when it may be all that is needed to turn the tide.

In conclusion, may I say that I respect the motives of sincere patriots like General Robert E. Wood who believe that on the grounds of national interest we should primarily concentrate upon defending this hemisphere and not give much aid to Britain. I believe them to be mistaken because the front-line of American defense is at the moment the British Channel, but I believe them to be intellectually honest men. But I cannot respect men and women whose arguments are primarily swayed by their concern for the fortunes of the totalitarian governments of Germany, Italy, and Russia. And in all honesty what can we say of men who urged up until August 23, 1939, that the United States adopt a policy of collective security and give all aid to the nations attacked by Fascism (which they labeled as the supreme danger) and who abruptly reversed themselves after that when Stalin signed his treaty of alliance with Hitler. These men who were loud in their verbal protestations of loyalty to Democracy now spend their energies in denouncing it while they are silent about the horrors of totalitarianism. Instead of continuing to advocate the giving of aid to the attacked, they now favor complete isolation for the United States and the withdrawal of all aid to England and Greece. They say it is improper for us to send war material to these hard-pressed countries, but they are either silent about or actually defend the Russian policy of supplying the aggressor Germany with oil and other war essentials. They demand freedom to attack Democracy in this country while defending the practice of Stalin in shooting anyone who dares to advocate Democracy in Russia. They are opposed to our aiding England with guns but they supported Russia's war on Poland and on democratic Finland. In short, they are hopelessly inconsistent. They stand revealed before the American people in all their intellectual and moral nakedness. Some of these men are the open or secret enemies both of Democracy and of this country. Others may be misguided dupes. There is no possibility of appealing to the former. There may be some in reasoning with the latter. For mankind is at a great testing moment in the history of the race, and we should not neglect an appeal to reason. And in conclusion, we would all do well to remember the speech of Hotspur, in King Henry IV.

> O, Gentlemen, the time of life is short.
> To spend that shortness basely, t'were too long
> If life did ride upon a dial's point
> Still ending at the conclusion of an hour.

War Is Not Romance

ERIC GILL*

Romance is not necessarily either pleasant or unpleasant—it is simply untrue. But some romantic views are pleasing, thus: it is pleasing to think of war as an affair in which more or less heroically brave and patriotic young men, led by brave and tough old generals and colonels go out and, with personal skill and daring, and complete disregard of their own safety, disarm the enemy in personal combat and drive him back to his own benighted country. This is a pleasing idea. For the wounds and hardships endured and inflicted are a very small part of the picture and are heavily balanced by the glory of the virtues displayed: courage, constancy, comradeships, and by the glory of the result aimed at: the defeat of our country's enemies and their complete frustration and ignominy.

We have been brought up to look thus at war. We have been taught that past wars were like that. Poems and picture books and history books—all tell the same tale, and perhaps it is all quite true! For there can be little doubt that in what are called "pre-industrial times," in the old days when everything was made by hand and there were no factories and no machines, war must have been a handmade affair too.

It is difficult for us to imagine such a world, but we do know that it quite certainly existed and for many thousands of years—in fact, for all the thousands of years of man's history until a very few years ago. And there is every reason to think that a handmade militarism was as different from a mechanized militarism as handmade clothes and handmade houses are different from machine-made clothes and machine-made houses, as different as a horse and cart is from a motor car. And so it was very likely quite possible and natural to sing songs about it and write great poems, and they actually had drums and pipes and fifes playing in the front lines of the battles—and they carried flags and banners, which they defended to the last. That sort of warfare lasted until a few years ago—for our mechanized industrialism is only 150 years old and has only become all-pervading for less than fifty.

It is natural and inevitable that we should cling desperately to the old ideas and be quite unable to think of war in any other way. Habits are difficult to get out of and especially habits of thought, particularly when they are many thousands of years old. And when in addition we are not helped to get out of them but every possible thing is done to hinder us and to ensure that we go on thinking in the old way, then of course it is much more difficult.

The very same people—our rulers and governors, our princes of commerce and financiers, who do everything they can to destroy the old-fashioned notion of the pre-industrial craftsman and to show what a backward and back-numberish kind of person he was, with all his ideas of personal responsibility and craftsmanship—these very same people, with every means at their disposal—the press, the radio, the compulsory schools—do everything in their power to preserve the old ideals of war-making. They have mechanized war no less than they have mechanized our working life and our entertainments, yet they talk and write about war as though it were still a business of bands, flags, swords, and spears.

In those olden times when things were made by individual persons working for their individual personal customers, they used to say that work was for the honor and glory of God, and the service of their fellow men. They thought of war in the same way. But now workmen are not responsible persons making things for their personal customers; they are factory hands, factory "coolies" (Hitler), mere parts of the machinery of production—production for profit. Our leaders of commerce admit this themselves! And if all production is for profit, then what is war for? In a world ruled by men of commerce and bankers and financiers, and in which all production is for profit, is it likely—I say is it?—that war should be for the honor and glory of God? On the contrary, it seems quite obvious that it is not. Yet that is what most people persuade themselves to believe—that is what they say!

Well, this is one way in which we think romantically about war—when we forget that soldiers today are simply another kind of factory hands, irresponsible units in a great machine, and when we think that a war promoted, or at least supported by men of commerce and financiers can ever be a holy war and one waged for God's honor and glory!

There is another way in which we are romantic and so fail to realize the nature of war today. That is when we think of it as a business of fighting according to a sort of pre-arranged rules. This is all very old-fashioned and unreal today—it is just the same in business and industrialism. Of course there used to be rules in the old pre-industrial days. But then those old-fashioned workmen and craftsmen thought of themselves as men. And as they were men, so they were sinners. To sin is to break the rules, the rules of God. The old-fashioned workman thought that over and above him there were, for example, the Ten Commandments. Also there were the rules of his craft and he thought of them as a sort of sacred "mystery." And so it was in warfare. Over and above the soldiers and the army was the Lord of Hosts, the Lord of the hosts of heaven. And so there were rules of warfare, just as there are in boxing and football. The rules were often broken, but breaking rules is not the same as saying that there are not any, and being a sinner is not the same as saying that there are no Ten Commandments.

Well, as you know, we have done away with all that in business and commerce and finance. It is one of the biggest achievements of modern business, our modern industrialism, our capitalism, that religion has nothing to do with it. Religion has nothing to do with business. Religion is your private affair. We do not mind what religion you have so long as you keep it to yourself. The enterprising industrialist will build chapels for you if that will help to keep you quiet. But, anyway, religion has nothing to do with "profit and loss," nothing to do with the balance sheet, nothing to do with double-entry bookkeeping. And this is inevitable, for modern business is not run in the interests of persons, either workers or consumers. It is run in the interests of investors. Behind the workers, the

*Mr. Eric Gill died November 17, 1940. He was a prominent English Catholic; a sculptor of note; and an active advocate of peace.—*Editor.*

managers, even the directors, are the thousands of anonymous investors whose only concern is that the business shall be run so as to produce dividends, and you know that religion has nothing to do with it. You know it is so.

Now that is our kind of world. And that is the kind of world which is at war. Why should we suppose that, though religion has nothing to do with business, directly they go to war men of business suddenly go all goofy with religion? That is just pure romance.

And another way in which we are romantic is when we think of war today as a business of soldiers—not merely "Onward Christian Soldiers" but soldiers of any kind. A soldier is a person who follows the profession of fighting, the profession of arms, the vocation or calling of a fighting man. The *vocation,* the *calling!* There is a funny old-fashioned idea for you! Very old-fashioned, for in ancient times there used to be such things. It was quite a common idea, even a universal idea, that every man had his own proper vocation or calling. It was even thought that the calling was from God—that it was God who called. (We still have the same idea enshrined in our common speech, as when we say "so and so follows the 'calling' of a brick layer.") And so it was thought that in some way everyone was called by God to follow the profession or occupation for which he was specially fitted by his nature, and that his nature was what God made and his calling what God willed.

But of course we have done away with all that. You do not have a vocation to the factory. The siren may call, but it is not "the voice of a siren." It is the voice of the timekeeper. It is the business of "clocking in." Nothing you do in the factory or behind the shop-counter is especially your affair—your personal service either to God or to your fellow men. You do not feel you would be wasting your special gifts if you did anything else. You are not expected to have any special gifts; special gifts are a nuisance. The machine does not run on special gifts. They get in the way and clog the works. If you have any special gifts, you have no business to be there. But, unless your special gifts are very special indeed there is not anywhere else for you to go. So you must forget all about such things and look forward to the time when the whistle blows.

As we have done away with the whole idea of vocation, we cannot of course expect people to have a vocation to the army. There used to be such a thing! It may seem strange to us, but it is a fact that people did actually believe themselves "called" to that profession. They thought that they had special gifts for it, gifts which would be wasted anywhere else. They thought soldiering was a great and honorable trade, requiring special love and aptitude and meriting special honor and reward. Now, of course, all that has been done away with. In mechanized warfare anyone will do. He has to be of average health, but otherwise there is nothing special about it, nothing requiring special gifts or special love. The machine gun is, after all, a machine and that is the kind of business it is: machine guns and barbed wire and bombs, a pretty business and well-suited to our industrial commercial world. But to go on thinking of war as a business of soldiers and soldiering is just romanticism. For, as Pope Pius XII said: "In this age of mechanization the human person becomes merely a more perfect tool in industrial production . . . and a perfected tool for mechanized warfare."

Take the scales from your eyes. Forget the neat, smart uniforms. Forget the solemn speeches of prime ministers and archbishops. Forget the majesty of battleships and their lovely mechanical efficiency. Forget the cleverness of chemists and mechanics with their bombs and machine guns. Forget even the pains and miseries, the wounds and destruction. These things are dreadful enough, a desecration of the "temple of the Holy Ghost." But there is a worse thing than these: the abomination of desolation is the denial of charity.

Cast away the scales from your eyes. Look at Europe as it must appear to the saints in heaven, to the onlookers. In what way can it look any different from a bestial quarrel between two sinful women? England and Germany! Each seeking how she may claw her neighbor's eyes out. Each seeking how she may best arouse and maintain a spirit of hate and fear. Here is no prize fight, more or less good-humoredly conducted according to rules. Here is no contest of professional armies, trained and willing champions of their countries. Here is no David and Goliath, no "thin red line of heroes." Here are whole nations pitted against one another. Every man and woman are combatants, each in their several ways. There are no civilians, no non-combatants. All are guilty, all are victims.

What then?

It is not armies at war, but nations. And when nations fight nations, it is no longer the more or less glorious business belauded by Homer or in the *Song of Roland.* It is not a sort of Battle of Trafalgar. It is no longer even a Battle of the Somme. Each side only waits for the other to commit some bestiality and then follows suit. They admit this; they call it "reprisals." Do you think we shall not use poison gas? We shall certainly do so, if the Germans do. Our leaders are proud to boast that we have got it all ready for them. Do you think that we are not abusing and cursing one another? But listen to some of our politicians. Read our newspapers. They lose no opportunity for pointing out the crimes of our enemies. They suppress all signs of humility and repentance in our own people. It is not vulgar abuse; it is not vulgar boasting—not always. It is more subtle, even more wicked, than that. It is a steady pressure of propaganda quietly poisoning the minds of the people.

I say this then: Seeing the matter without the mists of romance, ridding our minds of false glamor and unreal, out-of-date notions about war—personal prowess and glory, the honor and glory of God, the vocation of soldiering—I say that this is the true picture of war today, totalitarian war.

The conclusion is obvious. War must be stopped. It is no excuse for continuing, that one side is more wicked than the other. It is no excuse for continuing, that if we do not "fight to a finish" the enemy will overrun our country. Up and down the country there is a vast body of people—many more than the Government supposes—which sees the truth of what Mr. Neville Chamberlain himself said in his pacifist days: "War cures nothing, wins nothing." Let us help to lead that body of people and to confirm their opinion. Let us call upon the neutral states to interpose, not by writing letters and having diplomatic conversations, but by refusing to have any commercial or other dealings with the belligerent countries, the quarreling countries, the countries which are at one another's throats, until they agree to a real conference with judges appointed by and from the neutral countries; a conference in which the bel-

ligerents shall be properly represented but in which they shall not be the judges. Those who are fighting are the worst judges of their cause.

And do you think it impossible that the neutral countries could arrive at a just conclusion? Do you think it impossible that they should interpose? Are they all so keen on making money out of the war, or out of its results? Would they admit that?

I leave the question thus: I am not a politician or even a financier. I see the matter as a mere human being. Do you not see how mad, how impossibly mad, how impossibly mad and wicked and horrible the spectacle is? And if horrible as a spectacle, infinitely worse in reality.

Or do you mean to say that nothing can be done but let them fight to a finish, which means exhaustion? Is that really the kind of world we human beings have made?

Finally, remember that when two people or peoples are fighting it is not they who can be appealed to. It is the neighbors who are responsible for its continuance. It is the neighbors, the neutral states, who are chiefly to blame, and upon whom the shame chiefly falls. They are not nice clean people who have not soiled their hands with fighting but shameful neighbors who have stood around and even made money out of it.

This is crying for the moon. What of it? I am not putting this forward as practical politics, though it ought to be practical politics. My object is to state, if possible, a true view, to show where the chief disgrace lies, and whence stopping the war should naturally come, if from anywhere.

Philosophy and Religion

ARCHIE J. BAHM

While philosophy is very much like science, especially in aim, attitude, and method, both philosophy and science are very different from religion.

The aim of philosophy and of science is to understand the universe. The aim of religion is not so much to understand the universe as to remove fear of the mysteriously harmful and to conserve whatever one deems most precious and valuable. It is often said that philosophy seeks a unified view of the world, while religion seeks unity with the world or with the beneficent powers in it.

Differences in aim make for differences in attitude, method, problems, and theories.

Like the philosophical attitude, the religious attitude is persistent. Men naturally seek security persistently. But, unlike the philosophical attitude, the religious attitude is highly emotional. Men naturally are vitally concerned about their security. Faith, hope, and charity—belief and confidence, aspiration and longing, benevolence and brotherly love—these are important in many religions. But open-mindedness, suspended judgment, doubting, and reasoning are not essential. Dogmatism is permissible, especially concerning vital issues.

Faith versus reason, trust in tradition versus experimentation, acceptance of authoritative revelation versus acceptance of experience—these claimed differences between philosophy and religion are only partially true. Philosophy and science also rest on faith—faith in the validity of principles of reasoning, faith in the usefulness of experimentation, faith in the reliability of experience. They also rest on tradition, for there are traditions in philosophy and science which are quite compelling in their actual effects upon contemporary thinking. Also they rest on revelation of insights through countless discoveries. Further, religion does not exclude reasoning, experience, experimentation from its methods, but depends upon them whenever they seem to serve. The methods of religion are suited to its problems, and if prayer or worship, intuition or revelation, sacrifice or service are relied upon, probably they better serve the immediate demands of religious practice.

The problems of religion, unlike those of science and philosophy, are primarily practical, not theoretical. Religion seeks to achieve the good life. Philosophy and science seek to understand life. As we succeed better in understanding, we should succeed better in achieving; as our philosophy and science improve, our religion should improve. As we come to know more about the new unknown, we should become more unafraid of the unknown.

If philosophy can be called the mother of the sciences, then religion can be called the mother of philosophy, grandmother of the sciences. It was out of the practical needs of religion—the needs of controlling the mysterious—that philosophical quests began. And these quests are continued today for the same purpose that they began—to understand the mysterious world so that we may, through religious and other everyday practices, achieve happiness by controlling our world, preventing the bad, promoting the good.

Sadly enough, philosophy and science tend to forget their debt to religion—forget that they owe their origin to religion and that in the end they are accountable to religion as well as to other wealth-getting and wealth-preserving practices. They exist, at least in part, for religion's sake. Scientists' ignorance or denial of that relation does not thereby destroy it.

Sadly and oddly enough, religion has been a queer and not too loving mother, certainly not a very sympathetic mother. She has misunderstood her children, perhaps somewhat naturally, since each generation thinks that the next generation is "going to the dogs." If she has at times disowned them, in periods of anger or self-righteous pride, she can yet not deny their birthright. And if she will not permit them to serve her in accordance with their ability, they will serve only elsewhere, perhaps only selfishly. When religion despises scientific services, both science and religion suffer—religion through impoverished practice, science through incomplete appreciation.

Salvation is religion's practical problem. Salvation, variously interpreted by varying creeds and sects, is

preservation of that which is good, is conservation of values, is saving and securing things considered worthwhile. Everyone naturally wants these things. "Deliver us from evil," free us from fear, protect us from harm. Everyone sane says, "Yes." Religion seeks salvation directly, philosophy and science only indirectly. Religion is practical, philosophy and science theoretical.

Practice may depend upon theories, but theory and practice are not the same. Theorizing is not a primary business of religion. Religious theories are usually philosophical or scientific theories—oftentimes theories of ages past rather than present. But they are incidental to religion, and they are as varying as the different problems and attitudes and methods of religious men.

Already it should be obvious that philosophy and religion are interdependent. Religion is dependent upon scientists and philosophers for its theoretical progress. Science and philosophy are dependent upon religious specialists for their practical application in those life crises which cry for immediate action.

The notorious combat carried on between scientists and clericals during the last century, and which in the minds of some is still going on, is a product, like most other combats, of misunderstanding. Narrow views usually produce disputes.

On the one hand, religious specialists had succeeded in perfecting certain practices out of the rough pressure of religious experiences. These practices worked successfully so long as they were employed in their proper sphere. On the other hand, scientists had discovered some newer practices, some of which were even more successful in many respects than those of religion in solving certain problems, though not always the same problems.

Now the basic assumptions involved in the theories of explanation produced to account for these successful practices apparently were inconsistent. And if each of the theories of explanation was taken as all-explanatory, as complete accounts of the nature of the world, there was a genuine conflict indeed. The mistake of both science and religion in the recent past has been to assume that an explanation which was successful in a certain area of experience thereby accounted for all possible areas of experience.

The philosopher, accustomed to settling quarrels among the scientists themselves, has found falling to him the task of settling quarrels between scientists and religionists. And the method used here is quite the same. The evidence presented in religious experiences is evidence which cannot be left out of any picture of the world which is finally complete. If the sciences have neglected these experiences, then they are at fault, and the proper corrective must be recommended. This neglect has given rise to philosophy of religion and, more recently, to psychology of religion. Religious experiences are about to come in for their due examination, scientifically.

Any final settlement of this waning dispute must bring a little more humility to the scientist than he has had in the recent past. And, too, the religious enthusiast, when the scientists' overstatements are recalled and apologized for, must look fairly upon the evidence which scientists have so ably collected, admit its worth, and revise his insistences accordingly. If he fails to do this, he will suffer. And if he fails to do this, he deserves to suffer. The tragedy lies not so much in the defeat of the individual enthusiast as in the delusion, dissatisfaction, and defeat of those of us who depend upon him as our religious specialist.

The clergy who claim exclusive right to interpret truth, whether through superior intuition, special revelation, or traditional right, unwittingly are among the greatest enemies of religion. So long as churchmen ignore the factual evidence of intellectual investigators and the obvious interpretations honestly drawn, religion herself will suffer. The pains of cultural lag in religion are pitiful pains indeed. Eventually they cause a collapse. Then a religious revival must occur, but only through a clearing away of the high priests of the established tradition. If religion outgrows religionists, or if religionists retard religion too much, both suffer. But religion must go on, must grow on, to meet new needs of progressing people. Catastrophes of cast-off religions seem seldom to remind religionists that when they cease to provide the kind of salvation their people need, they cease to be good servants of religion.

Success in such a settlement may depend upon how adequately the philosopher can bring the scientist and religionist to see themselves in their proper perspective. People are naturally credulous about their self-importance. Any attempt to diminish one's self-esteem will not be met with a warm welcome. The role of the mediator is hard, and often thankless. But it is a very necessary role, and we ought to recognize it for what it is worth.

Perhaps, as many critics have pointed out, the philosopher has not been sufficiently courageous in calling the quarrelers to task. Perhaps he has been cowardly, turning to each in turn and saying, "yes, you are right." Or perhaps he has been bold and conscientious, but his counsel has been rejected, with mere suspicion or with vehemence, for in wartime we naturally say, "He who is not for me is against me." Or perhaps the rumpus and furore has been so loud that his counsel went unheard and unheeded.

As the combatants begin to wear themselves out, and begin to respect each other as somewhat durable fighters, they may arrive in a mood where they can listen to a mediator. Let us hope that the philosopher has not wearied of being unheeded for so long. The time is ripe for reconsideration.

The Judge

It is the law.
Prison. This pacifistic will
Must not prevail in such a dangerous hour.
I must uphold the law:
It is the mode of being
Of this our world which may be foul,
But it is all we have.
If the law is broken the world breaks,
Explodes like fireworks into nothingness.
I envy you that you can claim
Beyond this dust the far substantial stars.
You, who walk already in the future,
May be inept with this our puny present.
We are afraid your strong young hands may crush
The only hell we know.
You stand condemned—yet not you.
I stand condemned—yet not I.
It is the law, it is the law. . . .

EDITH LOVEJOY PIERCE

On the Pacifist Front

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

[Under the heading "On the Pacifist Front" there will be published in UNITY from time to time such news as can be gathered about pacifists and pacifist activities in these war days. Readers are urgently invited to send to me such items of interest as may come to their attention.]

XXXIII

The *Christian Century* publishes the following Chicago note:

Seeking to bring the weight of the religious conviction of America to bear on the problem of getting and keeping a just and lasting peace, a group of ministers have organized the "Ministers No War Committee." Its chairman is Albert W. Palmer, president of the Chicago Theological Seminary, and its secretary is Charles F. Boss, Jr. This committee is addressing a letter to all of the Protestant ministers in the country urging them to oppose the Lease-Lend Bill. They say: "We are convinced that the Lease-Lend Bill is a long stride away from democracy and toward dictatorship in the United States. We further believe that it makes probable, if not certain, a swift entry into the war." They urge ministers to write or wire senators, to call opposition meetings, to organize community groups in opposition, to pray for peace and to send their names to the committee at 740 Rush St., Chicago. Among the signers of the letter are: Harold A. Bosley, Harold L. Bowman, Rufus D. Bowman, F. W. Burnham, Robert L. Calhoun, Harold C. Case, Allan Knight Chalmers, Albert Buckner Coe, Henry Hitt Crane, Albert E. Day, Fred Eastman, Harry Emerson Fosdick, J. Warren Hastings, Bishop W. E. Hammaker, Georgia Harkness, Arthur E. Holt, Allan A. Hunter, Paul Hutchinson, Paul Jones, Willis J. King, Bishop J. Ralph Magee, Oscar E. Maurer, A. J. Muste, Kirby Page, Edwin McNeill Poteat, Ralph W. Sockman, Alfred W. Swan, Ernest Fremont Tittle and Rt. Rev. Frank E. Wilson.

The *Friends Intelligencer* reports:

One per cent of the first 800,000 draftees called under the Selective Service Act filed questionnaires as conscientious objectors, according to an estimate issued by the National Committee on Conscientious Objectors.

Ernie Pyle, Scripps-Howard staff writer in England, reports the following episode in a special dispatch:

Between York and Newcastle I was in a compartment with a middle-aged civilian, an officer of the merchant marine, and a very young commissioned officer of fusiliers, and we all talked our heads off.

We got to talking about conscientious objectors. They're called "conchies" over here. These two young fellows in uniform were completely tolerant of the conchies. They felt that if a fellow was sincere he should be allowed to do some kind of nonmilitary work. There was no bitterness in them at all against the conchies.

A United Press dispatch from London states:

Viscountess Astor, American-born M. P., said today that men were a positive menace to any country and that "until women take a hand there is little chance of world peace."

Addressing a meeting of the British Federation of Business and Professional Women attended by women of fourteen nationalities, she said: "We can see what men alone are doing by looking at the great dictators, who think that women are born only to have children to fight their wars."

The Associated Press carries the following dispatch from Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania:

A grand jury indicted today the Reverend Allen Clay Lambert, pastor of the Sinking Valley United Lutheran Church near Altoona, on charges of draft evasion. He is the father of three children. Mr. Lambert announced from his pulpit his intention to refuse to register for training, asserting that he conceived selective training to be out of harmony with his understanding "of the will and word of God."

The *Christian Century* reports the following:

It is announced that at least four work camps for conscientious objectors will be sponsored by the American Friends Service Committee, in coöperation with the Federal Council of Churches, the Methodist Commission on World Peace, and the Disciples of Christ. Interdenominational camps will be at Cooperstown, N. Y., San Dimas, Cal., and the Patapsco state forest near Baltimore, Md. The church bodies will also coöperate in an interdenominational camp in Indiana. The Mennonites will operate similar camps at Colorado Springs, Colo., Grottoes, Va., and Bluffton, Ind.; the Church of the Brethren at Onekema, Mich., Lagro, Ind., and in southwestern Pennsylvania. Basic camp equipment such as cots, blankets, heating and cooking stoves, and cooking and eating equipment will be provided by the government. Cost of maintenance and administration will be carried by the religious groups. It will average $35 per month per man.

Information obtained from the national selective service headquarters in Washington, based on reports from all of the state branches of the service, reveals that the number of special camps for conscientious objectors may eventually total 100. Plans for the construction of the camps are not yet complete but several of the camps have been started and at least 25 are now projected in various states. Operation of the camps will be dependent on the financial assistance of religious organizations.

In an editorial in the *Christian Evangelist* appears the following:

A letter just received from William Robinson of Birmingham [England] tells us that there is practically no conflict in England between the C.O.'s and the Government. There is no persecution of the C.O.'s as there was in 1914. We rather doubt whether the same thing would be true in America.

An Associated Press dispatch from Washington, D. C., states:

Archbishop Francis J. Spellman, of New York, asserted that "the victory that is to change the face of the earth must come from the onward march of Christian soldiers" dressed "in the armor of God."

"And the armor of God," he added, "is not in the ancient equipment of breastplate, shield and sword, nor in the modern implements of bombs, tanks and airplanes.

"In the Apostle's enumeration, the spiritual weapons that will overcome the enemy are truth, justice, the gospel of peace, faith, the hope of salvation, the word of God."

He repeated a prayer of Pope Pius XII: "Peace among men, which Thou desirest, is dead. Bring it back to life. O Divine Conqueror of Death!"

The *Nofrontier News Service* reports the following from London, England:

In response to the detailed report of the beating of conscientious objectors in the camp at Dingle Vale, Captain Margesson, recently selected War Secretary, has promised not only any further investigation that may be necessary, but that one officer and six non-commissioned officers are to be tried by court martial.

The *Christian Century* reports the following from England:

According to the headquarters of the War Resisters International in England, 31,224 conscientious objectors had appeared before c.o. tribunals up to November 1, 1940. No figures, it was stated, are available on the total c.o. registration. Of those appearing before the tribunals, 2,167 were granted unconditional exemption, 11,722 received conditional exemption provided they engage in "land work," 9,315 were

given non-combatant duties, and 8,020 were registered for military service.

Stanley Rappeport, New York Secretary of the Young People's Socialist League, was sentenced to two years in the penitentiary for refusing to register under the Draft Act. The New York *Call* reports his statement to the jury as follows:

"I am not a criminal, as the prosecution attempts to make me out," he said. "I am not a draft evader. I left all the facts about myself at my local board."

But, he continued, he could have no part in a law which could be used to order strikers either to work or to the army, which set up a passport system for 16,000,000 young Americans. "This law hastens both war and dictatorship in America, and at the same time the people are denied the right to vote on war," he declared. He had seen holes made in laws in Germany and Italy "for good men," but they were the holes used by "bad men" later to institute totalitarianism. And today, thousands are in concentration camps because when they had the chance to fight they did nothing, he concluded.

The *Friends Intelligencer* publishes the following items about work in England:

In the Friends Ambulance Unit, the majority of the workers are young C. O.'s. There are also a number of young women of like convictions, and a most useful leavening of older Friends who bring experience to the group. More people are available for the work than can be absorbed at present because of lack of funds. At present £1,500 a month is being spent, while Roger Wilson estimates that a total of £50,000 in 1941 and possibly £100,000 in 1942 will be required if the war continues that long. The need is urgent, he writes, but "We would not have you exaggerate our plight. Nobody could say life was altogether pleasant in this country at present. Nights are apt to be noisy in London and a 'blitz' on a provincial city is a terrible experience, as it can be in London when the attack is concentrated on a particular area. But broadly speaking we have food, warmth, good humor, and remarkably little war fever. What is needed is plenty of cement of human fellowship, particularly between pacifists and the majority of our fellow citizens, so that we may have a healthier basis for reconstruction. The fact that so few of our young men are in prison during this war has meant a great strengthening of the spiritual concern of the units engaged in relief work.

A young member of the Friends Ambulance Unit lost his life in a recent air raid. This was Norman Booth, a Bristol Friend, who had just come off duty at a rest-centre for bombed folk, and he was killed by the effects of an exploding bomb outside the building where he was having a meal. He was a Friend who had claimed unconditional exemption at the C. O. tribunal and had been granted it. He had afterwards joined the F. A. U. entirely voluntarily and as his expression of service to mankind. Since the Blitzkrieg had started he had been doing shelter and rest-centre work and had been one of the emergency squad of the F. A. U. which had gone down to Bristol after the raids there and helped start a rest-centre at the Friars Meeting House. As far as I know he is the first C. O. engaged in relief work who has lost his life as the result of air raids.

On the same day another young Friend, George Oswald Marsh, elder son of Oswald and Catharine Marsh, Friends whose roots lie in Northern Ireland, died from the result of serious injuries received when a bomb struck the factory in which he was working. He was a clever young scientist.

The following dispatch from Rome, Italy, was published in the New York *Times:*

The distribution and dissemination of a pastoral letter issued by Mgr. Giovanni Cazzani, Bishop of Cremona, has been prohibited by the Cremona authorities, it is learned. The letter, which was read from the pulpits of the Cremona churches last week, contained the warning that "war is the punishment of God" to nations that abandon the Christian faith and "deny the existence of God" to embrace "idolatry."

Excerpts from the letter were printed in the *Osservatore Romano* on March 7.

"God punishes peoples," said the letter as cited by the newspaper, "by abandoning them to unworthy shepherds or to perverse or inept rulers or by permitting that even the better ones among them commit fatal errors, oversights or miscalculations, or by permitting the arrogance and ferocity of other nations to be unleashed against them. It is thus that wars are born.

"Almost the whole modern world has practically, if not theoretically, detached itself from God; and when it has not denied His existence it has perverted His concepts, disavowed God's law and right and become idolatrous.

"Now it is paying for its many idolatries."

The Birmingham [England] *Town Crier* asked Bernard Shaw for his war aims, and Shaw replied:

"I have none. War is no use to me. What is war when it comes to tin tacks?

"We plaster Turin, Milan, and Hamburg with bombs, and the B. B. C. exults and claims a triumph for Britain. The Germans then plaster Birmingham, Coventry, and Southampton; and Lord Haw-Haw claims a triumph for the Reich. But what does Europe gain? Nothing but six of her cities damaged, her humanity horrified, her civilization undone. What has all this devilment—this mug's game—to do with my aims, which are all at betterment, not at death and destruction?"

The Study Table

Poets Think for Themselves and Feel for Others

Does Niagara now fall upward? Has lightning become a dark scar of shadow against the sky? As well ask if, despite desertions by a few, the poets have exchanged faith for fear, world-embracing love for hate, heaven-hunting pioneering for U. S. A.-brand Fascism. The poets are yet at their posts.

Cleverest among current books is one by a faithful contributor to UNITY, himself a distinguished editor and in his more exalted moods a major poet, Stanton A. Coblentz. It is *Senator Goose,*[1] a most Aesophisticated volume of the goose that proposed a law forbidding thought as treason to the state, of the wolf who was glad to escape from his cage so he could return to the jungle where life is civilized, and of many another creature satirizing man.

Elmo Russ, who has performed a signal service for contemporary poetry through setting so much of it to music, proves his own poetic mettle in *This Fragile Fruit.*[2] In it occur such thoughtful lines as these, "Minds going forward burn their bridges after" and "I knew that nothing really was my own." But there is more of sensitivity than significance.

Gordon Le Claire, who seems to some of us one of the living immortals and whose poems frequently appear in UNITY, contributes a foreword to *Warmth of Amber*[3] by Robert L. Dark, Jr., a masterpiece of sonnet virtuosity. Both Dark's brochure and Russ' are exquisite in format. Vital in contents and vigorous in appearance are the productions of Ben and Isabel Hagglund, whose own *Pyramid, Book* 1[4] is a delectable dish, a boullabaise of oddly assorted fish drawn in the net of fancy. Prose, poetry, pictures, but all of them reflecting heroically creative spirits pilloried in an age which values only acquisition.

You who have read her socially and spiritually aroused poems in UNITY will especially delight, we are sure, in Kate Butler's new book, *We Walk in Wonder.*[5]

Colorful nature poems, tenderly understanding poems of people and their problems, broadminded and wide-hearted philosophic poems! Typical is "Hidden Gold":

When the flicker opened his wings in our sight,
We knew they were lined with gold.
When the soul of man takes upward flight,
His hidden virtues are told.

We are proud of the fact that this book is dedicated to UNITY's poetry editors. Keeping her faith in the power of the spirit rather than in the force of arms, she expresses all true poets when she says, "My windows look on roses, but a sword has pierced my soul."

Luminous are the paintings of Mexico, California, the Southwest, Indian life, and human nature everywhere, in Kate Kirkham's second book, *Sunset Hour*.[6] Fidelity and vividness, sympathy and imagery always have illumined her work. But also here are wit and a pointedness which make such an etching as this find its way, as poetry should, through the heart to the memory:

Because she couldn't buy new shoes
A woman went grumbling up the street.
But one she met there changed her views
For it was a beggar who had no feet.

In *Rhyme and Reason*,[7] a volume which in common with all other real poetry transcends the personal, Anna Estes Strawbridge wisely counsels:

There is a kinship of age-old understanding
Though nations go to war, and creed fight creed,
Mothers across the world call other mothers
To strive while still there's time to heed.

A poet who thinks for herself and feels for others (a fairly good definition of a poet!) is Lena Mearle Shull, who in *Singing Waters*[8] declares:

How be content with a soul that goes
Through earth's great glory, but never grows!

This reminds us of Nell Thompson-Miller's "Parochial" in her admirably and intimately intense *Live Coals*.[9] In this deeply touching poem she speaks of a little lad with a withered arm and of a blind beggar, and then concludes:

But the most pathetic on God's sweet earth
Possesses a shriveled soul.

Tenderness breathes gently throughout the mingled melody and memory that is *Wind's Far Sowing*[10] by Ellida Pattison Bentley. Timely indeed is this reminder, "Thoughts Are Things":

Good thoughts of truth, when in love sent winging,
Broadcasting, vibrant, down the air,
Are things that will help the nations in bringing
A peace that all the world may share.

Virility is not exclusively a masculine possession—what that matters is? Nor is it incompatible with delicacy, charm, sensitivity. This is strongly proved by many of the poems in Mildred Henry's *Plumes from a Wild Bird's Wing*,[11] poems which might well have appeared in UNITY. Consider, for instance, the last stanza of "The Beautiful Meek,"

But the beautiful meek in the loftier place
Stand shoulder to shoulder, terror gone,
And out of the dusk, with a radiant face,
A swordless captain leads them on.

A beautiful book, artistic from its unique green binding through its fascinating Rodinesque illustrations to the last word of the last brief, vivid, free verse poem, is *Shadows of the Swamp*.[12] Mary Land Lock's eye sees beneath surfaces and her touch is magic. Not true of her as poet is the statement in one of her few rhymed poems,

The termite in my house
Is convention which brought
Destruction to wood
Of strongest thought.

Flora Cecile Allison in *Gore Lot*[13] ranges from New Orleans to Northern Lights, striking many a popular note delightfully. Getty N. Batson in *Night Stands Waiting*[14] reveals most enjoyable originality as in this stanza:

Up comes the moon,
A great cat's yellow eye
And little stars like mice
Scamper into holes
Within the sky.

Coronado[15] by Pearle R. Casey deserves more space than we can give it. Drenched in glamor, yet faithful historically, it belongs in every library of the Southwest.

And so the poets continue to open not only our eyes and ears but also our minds and hearts to the world around us. Nor will they bear a loyalty that excludes any. On the whole they are keeping to their pledge, "Poets May Be Nuts, but NOT in the War Machine."

RALPH CHEYNEY.

[1]*Senator Goose*, Stanton Coblentz, Wings Press, Mill Valley, Calif., with illustrations by Ruth Lee Morris, 64 pp., $2.00. [2]*This Fragile Fruit*, Elmo Russ, Poetry Caravan Press, Lakeland, Florida. [3]*Warmth of Amber*, Robert L. Dark, Jr., Poetry Caravan Press, Lakeland, Florida, $.75. [4]*Pyramid, Book I*, Ben and Isabel Hagglund, Hagglund Press, Las Animas, Colo., $.50. [5]*We Walk in Wonder*, Kate Butler, Banner Press, Emory University, Atlanta, Ga., 74 pp, $1.50. [6]*Sunset Hour*, Kate Kirkham, Banner Press, Atlanta, Ga., 83 pp. [7]*Rhyme and Reason*, Anna Estes Strawbridge, Banner Press, Atlanta, Ga., 36 pp. [8]*Singing Waters*, Lena Mearle Shull, Press of Flozari, Cleveland, Ohio, 29 pp., $.75. [9]*Live Coals*, Nell Thompson-Miller, Banner Press, Atlanta, Ga., 36 pp. [10]*Wind's Far Sowing*, Ellida Pattison Bentley, Banner Press, Atlanta, Ga., 28 pp. [11]*Plumes from a Wild Bird's Wing*, Mildred Putman Henry, Wings Press, Mill Valley, Calif., 64 pp., $1.50. [12]*Shadows of the Swamp*, Mary Land Lock, with illustrations by Jacques de Tarnowsky, Kaleidograph Press, Dallas, Tex., 60 pp. [13]*Gore Lot*, by Flora Cecile Allison, Banner Press, Atlanta, Ga., 49 pp. [14]*Night Stands Waiting*, Getty N. Batson, Banner Press, Atlanta, Ga., 35 pp. [15]*Coronado*, Pearle R. Casey, Banner Press, Atlanta, Ga., 95 pp.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 18)

"Through Orient seas, o'er Afric's plain
And Asian mountains borne,
The vigor of the Northern brain
Shall nerve the world outworn.

"From clime to clime, from shore to shore
Shall thrill the magic thread;
The new Prometheus steals once more
The fire that wakes the dead."

Throb on, strong pulse of thunder! beat
From answering beach to beach;
Fuse nations in thy kindly heat,
And melt the chains of each!

* * *

Weave on, swift shuttle of the Lord,
Beneath the deep so far,
The bridal robes of earth's accord,
The funeral shroud of war!

For lo! the fall of Ocean's wall
Space mocked and time outrun;
And round the world the thought of all
Is as the thought of one!

The poles unite, the zones agree,
The tongues of striving cease;
As on the Sea of Galilee
The Christ is whispering, Peace!